The JS-44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON PAGE TWO.)

and chank of court for the purp	Jose of initiating the offi	docker street. (o	LL IIIO IIIC	OHONO ON LAC	JE IVVO.	,	
I.(a) PLAINTIFFS KATTY VALLE, I\ ZENEYDA BALTO	/ANIA RAMIREZ, J ODANO	ANET RAMIF	REZ, and	DEFENDANTS ALLSTATE IN and DOES 1		NCE COMPANY, ar	ı Illinois Corp.,
(b) COUNTY OF RESIDENCE (EXCEPT	E OF FIRST LISTED PLAI IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CA		eo	(IN I NOTE: IN LAND	U.S. PLA	F FIRST LISTED DEFENDA INTIFF CASES ONLY) NATION CASES, USE THE OLVED.	
(c) ATTORNEYS (FIRM NAME, A Cynthia L. Mellema (Megan Dunham (Sta Sonnenschein Nath & 2121 N California Blv Telephone: (925) 94	State Bar No. 1227 te Bar No. 245991) & Rosenthal LLP rd., Suite 800, Waln	98)	94596	Law Office O	ouran (S f Leand n Stree	t, Berkeley, CA 947	•
II. BASIS OF JURISDIC	TION (PLACE AN "X" I	N ONE BOX ONLY)	1	ZENSHIP OF I			AN 'X' IN ONE BOX FOR PLAINTIFF NE BOX FOR DE FEND ANT)
1. U.S. Government Plaintiff 2. U.S. Government Defendant	3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Item III)		Citizen Citizen Citizen	of This State of Another State or Subject of a	PTF 1 2 3	DEF 1 Incorporated or Princip of Business In This 2 Incorporated and Princip of Business In Anot 3 3 Foreign Nation	PTF DEF pal Place 4 4 State pal Place 5 5 5
IV. ORIGIN	[PLACE AN "X	" IN ONE BOX ONLY)	<u></u>	in oound y			
		Remanded from opellate Court	4 Reinstate Reopen	Comment of the commen	ransferred fronther district (specify)		7 Appeal to District Judge from Magistrate Judgment
V. NATURE OF SUIT	(PLACE AN "X"IN ON						
CONTRACT 110 Insurance	PERSONAL INJURY	ORTS PERSONAL INJURY	,	FORFEITURE/PE	ENALTY	BANKRUPTCY 422 Appeal 28 USC 158	OTHER STATUTES 400 State Reapportionment
120 Marine 120 Marine 130 Miller Act 140 Negotiable Instrument 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment 151 Medicare Act 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excl. Veterans) 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits 160 Stockholders' Suits 190 Other Contract 195 Contract Product Liability 196 Franchise	☐ 310 Airplane ☐ 315 Airplane Product Liability ☐ 320 Assault, Libel & Slander ☐ 330 Federal Employers Liability ☐ 340 Marine ☐ 345 Marine Product Liability	362 Personal In Liability 365 Personal In Liability 368 Asbestos P Product L PERSONAL PROPE 370 Other Frauc 371 Truth in Ler 380 Other Personal State Property Damage 385 Property Da Product L	jury - practice jury -Product ersonal Injury Lability RTY d inding onal Property	620 Other Food & 625 Drug Related Property 21 630 Liquor Laws 640 RR & Truck 650 Airline Regs 660 Occupational Safety/Health 690 Other LABOR 710 Fair Labor Star 720 Labor/Mgmt. R Disclosure Ac 740 Railway Labo 790 Other Labor L	Seizure of USC 881	423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 PROPERTY RIGHTS 820 Copyrights 830 Patent 840 Trademark 861 HIA (1395ff) 862 Black Lung (923) 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) 864 SSID Title XVI 865 RSI (405(g))	400 State recapportionnent 410 Antitrust 430 Banks and Banking 450 Commerce/ICC Rates/etc. 460 Deportation 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations 480 Consumer Credit 490 Cable/Satellite TV 810 Selective Service 850 Securities/Commodities/Exchange 875 Customer Challenge 12 USC 3410 891 Agricultural Acts 892 Economic Stabilization Act
REAL PROPERTY	CIVIL RIGHTS	PRISONER PI	ETITIONS	791 Empl. Ret. Inc	•	FEDERAL TAX SUITS	893 Environmental Matters
210 Land Condemnation 220 Foreclosure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 240 Torts to Land 245 Tort Product Liability 290 All Other Real Property	441 Voting 442 Employment 443 Housing 444 Welfare 440 Other Civil Rights 445 Amer w/ disab - Other	510 Motions to No Sentence Ha 530 General 535 Death Penal 540 Mandamus & 550 Civil Rights 555 Prison Conc	abeas Corpus: ty & Other	Act		■ 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) ■ 871 IRS-Third Party 26 USC 7609	■ 894 Energy Allocation Act ■ 895 Freedom of Information Act ■ 900 Appeal of Fee ■ Determination Under ■ Equal Access to Justice ■ 950 Constitutionality of State ■ Statutes ■ 890 Other Statutory Actions
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION CITE JURISDICTIONAL ST. Petition to compel arbit	ATUTES UNLESS DIVE	ERSITY)					IT OF CAUSE. DO NOT
VII. REQUESTED IN CO		K IF THIS IS A C	LASS ACT			CHECK YES only	/ if demanded in complaint: DEMAND: YES NO
VIII. RELATED CASE(S	•		. 3-12 CON	CERNING REQU	IREMEN		DEIVIAND. [] TES [M NO
IF ANY IX. DIVISIONAL ASSIG		RELATED CASE 3-2)			2		STE
(PLACE AND "X" IN	ONE BOX ONLY)			NCISCO/OAKLA	AND	SAN JOSE	R
DATE March 20 2008	SIGNATU	RE OF ATTOR			_		

1 CYNTHIA L. MELLEMA (State Bar No. 122798) MEGAN L. DUNHAM (State Bar No. 245991) 2 SONNENSCHEIN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP 2121 N California Blvd., Suite 800 3 Walnut Creek, CA 94596 Telephone: (925) 949-2600 4 Facsimile: (925) 949-2610 Email: cmellema@sonnenschein.com E-filing 5 mdunham@sonnenschein.com 6 Attorneys for Defendant ALLSTATE INSURANCE COMPANY 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 9 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 10 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION 11 KATTY VALLE, IVANIA RAMIREZ, JANET RAMIREZ and ZENEYDA 12 NOTICE OF REMOVAL OF A CIVIL BALTODANO. Sonnenschein Nath & Rosenthal LLP 525 Market Street, 26⁷¹ Floor San Francisco, California 94105-2708 (415) 882-5000 ACTION 13 Plaintiffs, 14 VS. 15 ALLSTATE INSURANCE COMPANY, 16 Defendants. 17 18 TO THE CLERK OF THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA AND TO PLAINTIFFS AND THEIR 19 20 ATTORNEYS OF RECORD: PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. section 1441(a), defendant hereby 21 removes to this Court the action described herein and respectfully submits the following 22 23 statement of grounds for removal: 24

THE SUPERIOR COURT ACTION

On January 17, 2008, an action was commenced in the Superior Court of the State 1. of California for the County of San Mateo, entitled "Valle et al. v. Allstate Insurance Company, and Does 1 through 50, inclusive," Case No. CIV 46 9346 (the "Superior Court Action").

28

25

26

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1

2

3

4

5

In the Superior Court Action, plaintiffs seek damages on account of Allstate's alleged failure to arbitrate and pay their claim for underinsured motorist benefits. (Complaint, ¶ 3.) In the Complaint, plaintiffs petition the Court to compel arbitration. Further, plaintiffs assert a cause of action for breach of the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing for failure to arbitrate, seeking general and punitive damages, attorneys' fees and costs of suit.

SERVICE

Allstate is informed and believes that the Summons and Complaint in the Superior 3. Court Action have not yet been served on Allstate. Attached hereto as Exhibit A are true and correct copies of the Summons, Complaint and Notice of Case Management Conference that were mailed to Bill Gavin, arbitration counsel for Allstate, and Answer. Allstate believes these documents constitute all pleadings and documents on file in the Superior Court Action.

JURISDICTION

- Allstate is informed and believes that plaintiff Katty Valle was, at the time of filing 4. of the Superior Court Action, now is, and at all relevant times has been, a citizen and resident of the State of California.
- Allstate is informed and believes that plaintiff Ivania Ramirez was, at the time of 5. filing of the Superior Court Action, now is, and at all relevant times has been, a citizen and resident of the State of California.
- Allstate is informed and believes that plaintiff Janet Ramirez was, at the time of 6. filing of the Superior Court Action, now is, and at all relevant times has been, a citizen and resident of the State of California.
- Allstate is informed and believes that plaintiff Zeneyda Baltodano was, at the time of filing of the Superior Court Action, now is, and at all relevant times has been, a citizen and resident of the State of California.
- Defendant Allstate was, at the time of filing of the Superior Court Action, now is, 8. and at all relevant times has been, a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Illinois, with its principal places of business in the city of Northbrook, Illinois.
 - Plaintiff and Allstate, accordingly, are citizens and residents of different states.

SONNENSCHEIN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP 525 MARKET STREET, 26TH FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94105-2708 (415) 882-5000

AMOUNT IN CONTROVERSY

- 10. The amount in controversy in the Superior Court Action, exclusive of interest and costs, exceeds the \$75,000 jurisdictional minimum. Plaintiff Katty Valle has made a settlement demand for the \$100,000 policy limit. Plaintiffs Janet Ramirez and Zeneyda Baltodano have each demanded \$12,000. Plaintiff Ivania Ramirez has not yet made a demand. Plaintiffs therefore seek over \$124,000 in contract damages.
- 11. Additionally, plaintiffs seeks to recover attorney's fees. (Complaint, prayer for relief.) Attorney's fees incurred to compel payment of insurance policy benefits unreasonably withheld are recoverable as an element of damages under *Brandt v. Superior Court*, 37 Cal. 3d 813 (1985), and therefore must be included in calculating the amount of controversy. *Galt G/S v. JSS Scandinavia*, 142 F.3d 1150, 1155-56 (9th Cir. 1998).
- 12. Plaintiffs also seek an undisclosed amount of punitive damages. (Complaint, prayer for relief.) In calculating the amount in controversy, the Court must consider the punitive damages that may be recovered by plaintiffs if their claim for punitive damages should prevail. Surber v. Reliance Nat. Indem. Co., 110 F. Supp. 2d 1227, 1232 (N.D. Cal. 2000).

ORIGINAL JURISDICTION

- 13. The Superior Court Action is a civil action of which this Court has original jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. section 1332, in that plaintiffs and Allstate are citizens of different states and the amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000, exclusive of interest and costs.
- 14. The case is therefore one which Allstate may remove to this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. sections 1441 and 1446. The removal is effected less than thirty days after service of the Complaint in the Superior Court Action, in accordance with 28 U.S.C. section 1446(b).

WHEREFORE, Allstate hereby gives notice that this action has been removed, in its entirety, from the Superior Court of the State of California for the County of San Mateo to the United States District Court for the Northern District of California, San Francisco Division for further proceedings as though it originally had been instituted herein.

Document 1-2

Case 3:08-cv-01533-CRB

CASE NO.

Page 4 of 20

NOTICE OF REMOVAL

Filed 03/20/2008

EXHIBIT A

Feb. 13. 2008 2:17°M ALLSTATE

P. 2 No. 8685

SUMMONS (CITACION JUDICIAL)

NOTICE TO DEFENDANT: (AVISO AL DEMANDADO): ALLSTATE INSURANCE COMPANY.

YOU ARE BEING SUED BY PLAINTIFF: (LO ESTÁ DEMANDANDO EL DEMANDANTE): KATTY VALLE, IVANIA RAMIREZ, JANET RAMIREZ, and ZENEYDA BALTODANO

SUM-100

FOR COURT USE ONLY (SOLO PARA USO DE LA CORTE)

ENDORSED FILED SAN MATEO COUNTY

JAN 1 7 2008

Clerk of the Superior Court R. Monigomery

You have 30 CALENDAR DAYS after this summons and legal papers are served on you to file a written response at this court and have a copy served on the plaintiff. A letter or phone call will not protect you. Your written response must be in proper legal form if you want the court to hear your case. There may be a court form that you can use for your response. You can find these court forms and more information at the California Courts Online Self-Help Center (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp), your county law library, or the courthouse nearest you. If you cannot pay the filing fee, ask the court clark for a fee waiver form. If you do not file your response on time, you may lose the case by default, and your wages, money, and property may be taken without further warning from the court.

There are other legal requirements, You may want to call an attorney right away. If you do not know an attorney, you may want to call an attorney referral service. If you cannot afford an attorney, you may be eligible for free legal services from a nonprofit legal services program, You can locate these nonprofit groups at the California Legal Services Web site (www.lawhelpcalifornia.org), the California Courts Online Self-Help Center (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp), or by contacting your local court or county har association.

Tiene 30 DÍAS DE CALENDARIO después de que le entreguen esta citación y papeles legales para presentar una respuesta por escrito en esta coria y hacer que se entregue una copia al damandante. Una carta o una llamada telefónica no lo protegen. Su respuesta por escrito tiene que ester en formato legal correcto si desea que procesen su caso en la corte. Es posible que haya un formulario que usted pueda usar para su respuesta. Puede encontrar estos formularios de la corte y más información en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California (www.courtinfo.ca.gov/salfhelp/espanol/), en la biblioteca de leyes de su condado o en la corte que le quade más cerca. Si no puede pagar la cuota de presentación, pida al secretario de la corte que le dé un formulario de exención de pago de cuotas. Si no presente su respuesta a tiempo, puede perder el caso por incumplimiento y la corte le podrá quitar su sueldo, dinero y bienes sin más advertencia.

Hay otros requisitos legales. Es recomendable que llame a un abogado inmediatamente. Si no conoce a un abogado, puede llamer a un servicio de remisión a abogados. Si no puede pagar a un abogado, es posible que cumpla con los requisitos para obtener servicios legales gratuitos de un programa de servicios legales sin finas de lucro. Puede encontrar estos grupos sin finas de lucro en el sitio web de California Legal Services, (www.lawhelpcalifornia.org), en el Centro de Ayuda de las Cortes de California, (www.courtinfo.es.gov/selfhelp/espenol/) o poniéndose en contacto con la corte o el colegio de abogados locales.

The name and address of the court is: (El nombre y dirección de la corte es): 400 County Center, Redwood City, California, 94063

CASE NUMBER CIV 4 6 9 3 4 6

	FFICE OF LEANDRO rleton Street, Berkeley		-1046	E HON	TGOMERY	
DATE: (Fecha)	JAN 17 2008	JOHN C. FITTON	Clerk, by (Secretario)			, Deputy (Adjunto)
(SEAL)	NOT!	ICE TO THE PERSON SER as an individual defend as the person sued und on behalf of (specify):	lant.):	
	1	oder: CGP 416.10 (c	corporation) (efunct corporation) (essociation or partners	ship)	CCP 416.60 (minor) CCP 416.70 (conservates CCP 416.90 (authorized p	
	4.	other (specify): by personal delivery on			\$ (

ALLSTATE Feb. 13. 2008 2:18°M

No. 8685

LEANDRO H. DURAN, (SBN 121847) LAW OFFICE OF LEANDRO H. DURAN

1035 Carleton Street

Berkeley, California 94710 Telephone (510)540-1046

Facsimile (510)540-1036

ENDORSED FILED SAN MATEO COUNTY

JAN 1 7 2008

Clark of the Superior Court

Attorney for Petitioners KATTY VALLE, IVANIA RAMIREZ, JANET RAMIREZ, and ZENEYDA BALTODANO

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA,

COUNTY OF SAN MATEO,

UNLIMITED JURISDICTION

10

11

5

6 7

8

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24 25

26

27 28

KATTY VALLE, IVANIA RAMIREZ, JANET RAMIREZ, and ZENEYDA BALTODANO Petitioner(s).

VS.

ALLSTATE INSURANCE COMPANY, Respondent(s).

CN 469346 Case No.:

PETITION TO COMPEL ARBITRATION AND COMPLAINT FOR BREACH OF COVENANT OF GOOD FAITH AND FAIR DEALINGS.

Petitioners allege:

- On May 6, 2004 Katty Valle and Allstate Insurance Company entered into a written contract of motor vehicle bodily liability insurance. Pursuant to Insurance Code section 11580.2(b) petitioner is an "insured" and entitled to benefits under the policy.
 - 2. The agreement was made in San Mateo County, California.
- 3. On or about September 26, 2006 Katty Valle, Ivania Ramirez, Janet Ramirez, And Zeneyda Baltodano ("Petitoners") made a claim for damages under the uninsured/underinsured motorist provision of the policy. Although the petitioner made a demand for the insurer to begin proceedings to appoint an arbitrator, they (the insurer) failed to begin the process to appoint an arbitrator as to the amount of damages.

PETITION TO COMPEL ARBITRATION AND COMPLAINT FOR BREACH OF COVENANT OF GOOD FAITH AND FAIR PAGE 3/12 * RCVD AT 2/13/2008 4:20:10 PM [Central Standard Time] * SVR:CHI2KRF01/21 * DNIS:4781 * CSID:9254547473 * DURATION (mm-ss):03-44

I

2

3

6

9

10

11

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

- Pursuant to the policy, the parties agreed to arbitrate the issue of the claimant's legal entitlement to recovery and the amount of damages.
- 5. Petitioner filed an action in this court but later dismissed the action without prejudice after respondent Allstate Insurance acting through its legal representative agreed to submit the matter to retired Judge Richard Hodge and an arbitration process.
- 6. On or about November 16, 2007, petitioners did submit the case to Judge Richard Hodge for an arbitration date. A controversy has arisen regarding the scheduling of the arbitration, discovery, law and motion related matters and respondent refuses to arbitrate.
- 7. Petitioner has not waived the right to compel arbitration, and does not know of any ground that would permit the revocation of the contract of insurance.
- 8. The claimant does not have a worker's compensation claim arising from the uninsured motorist incident.
- 9. Petitioners alleges that the refusal to arbitrate and failure to make underinsured motorist benefits available is done in bad faith thereby constituting a breach of the covenant of good faith and fair dealings. The conduct is despicable, oppressive, and is in wanton disregard of petitioner's rights, thus, fraudulent.

WHEREFORE, petitioner(s) requests that:

- 1. The Court issue an order compelling the arbitration of this dispute and appointing a neutral arbitrator.
 - 2. That the Petitioners be awarded costs of suit and reasonable attorney fees.
 - 3. That the Petitioner be awarded general damages including punitive damages.
 - 4. That the Petitioners be awarded such other and further relief as the Court may deem proper.

Dated: 1/14/08

Attorney for Petitioners

VATTY VALLE WANTA DA

KATTY VALLE, IVANIA RAMIREZ, JANET RAMIREZ, and ZENEYDA BALTODANO

No. 8685 P. 5. Feb. 13. 2008 2:19°M ALLSTATE CM-010 ATORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY NEEDS \$2 number, and address! FOR COURT USE ONLY LAW OFFICE OF LEANDRO H. DURAN 1035 Carleton Street Berkeley, California 94710 TELEPHONE NO.: (510)540-1046 FAX N ATTORNEY FOR (Name): Valle, Ramirez & Baltodano RECEIVED SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF SAN MATEO. STREET ADDRESS: 400 County Center, JAN 1 7 2008 MAILING ADDRESS: CITY AND ZIP CODE: Redwood City, California, 94063. SUPERIOR COURT BRANCH NAME: CIVIL DIVISION CASE NAME: VALLE V ALLSTATE CIVIL CASE COVER SHEET CASE NUMBER: Complex Case Designation CIV 489346 √ Unlimited Limited Counter Joinder (Amount (Amount b mycedemanded demanded is Filed with first appearance by defendant exceeds \$25,000) \$25,000 or less) (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 3.402) DEPT Items 1-6 below must be completed (see instructions on page 2). 1. Check one box below for the case type that best describes this case: Contract Auto Tort Provisionally Complex Civil Litigation (Cal. Rules of Court, rules 3.400-3.403) Breach of contract/warranty (06) Auto (22) ✓ Uninsured motorist (46) Rule 3.740 collections (09) Antitrust/Trade regulation (03) Other PI/PD/WD (Personal Injury/Property Other collections (09) Construction defect (10) Damage/Wrongful Death) Tort Insurance coverage (18) Mass fort (40) Asbestos (04) Other contract (37) Securities litigation (28) Product llability (24) Environmental/Toxic tort (30) Real Property : Medical malpractice (45) Eminent domain/Inverse insurance coverage daims arising from the above listed provisionally complex case types (41) Other PI/PD/WD (23) condemnation (14) Wrongful eviction (33) Non-PI/PD/WD (Other) Tort Other real property (26) Enforcement of Judgment Business tort/unfair business practice (07) Enforcement of judgment (20) Civil rights (08) Unlawful Detainer Defamation (13) Commercial (31) Miscellaneous Civil Complaint Residential (32) Fraud (18) RICO (27) Drugs (38) Intellectual property (19) Other complaint (not specified above) (42) Professional negligence (25) Judicial Review Miscellaneous Civil Petition Other non-PVPD/WD tort (35) Asset forfelture (05) Partnership and corporate governance (21) Petition re: arbitration award (11) Employment Other petition (not specified above) (43) Wrongful termination (38) Writ of mandate (02) Other employment (15) Other judicial review (39) This case lis ✓ is not complex under rule 3,400 of the California Rules of Court. If the case is complex, mark the factors requiring exceptional Judicial management: Large number of separately represented parties Large number of witnesses Extensive motion practice raising difficult or novel b. [Coordination with related actions pending in one or more courts issues that will be time-consuming to resolve in other counties, states, or countries, or in a federal court c. Substantial amount of documentary evidence Substantial postjudgment judicial supervision 3. Remedies sought (oheck all that apply): a. 🗸 monetary b. 🗸 nonmonetary; declaratory or injunctive relief c. ___punitive Number of causes of action (specify): DECL RELIEF AND BREACH OF COVENANT_GOOD FAITH 5. This case __ iş Is not a class action sult. If there are any known related cases, file and serve a notice of related case. (You may use form AM-015.) Date: 1/14/08 LEANDRO H DURAN (TYPE OR PRINT NAME) NOTICE · Plaintiff must file this cover sheet with the first paper filed in the action or proceeding (except singly claims cases or cases filed under the Probate Code, Family Code, or Welfare and Institutions Code). (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 3.220.) Failure to file may result

File this cover sheet in addition to any cover sheet required by local court rule.

 If this case is complex under rule 3,400 et seq. of the California Rules of Court, you must serve a copy of this cover sheet on all other parties to the action or proceeding.

 Unless this is a collections case under rule 3,740 or a complex case, this cover sheat will be used for etablished num PAGE 5/12 * RCVD AT 2/13/2008 4:20:10 PM [Central Standard Time] * SVR:CHI2KRF01/21 * DNIS:4781 * CSID:9254547473 * DURATION (mm-ss):03-44 Feb. 13. 2008 2:19°M ALLSTATE No. 8685

*	POS-015
ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY (Name, State Bar number, and address): I.EANDRO H. DURAN, SBN 121847 —Law Offices of Leandro H. Duran 1035 Carleton St, Berkeley, CA 94710	FOR COURT USE CAILY
TELEPHONE NO: (510) 540-1046 FAX NO. (Optional): (510) 540-1036 E-MAIL ADDRESS (Pathonal): ATTORNEY FOR (Name): Katty Valle, Ivania Ramirez, Janet Ramirez, Zeneyda Baltodano	
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF SAIL Mateo STREET ADDRESS: 400 COUNTY CENTER NALING ADDRESS: CITY AND ZIP CODE RECEWOOD City, CA 94063 BRANCH NAME:	
PLAINTIFF/PETITIONER: Valle, et. al. DEFENDANT/RESPONDENT: Allstate Ins. Co.	
NOTICE AND ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF RECEIPT-CIVIL	CASE NUMBER: CIV 469346

TO (insert name of party being served): Alistate Insurance Co.

NOTICE

The summons and other documents identified below are being served pursuant to section 415.30 of the California Code of Civil Procedure. Your failure to complete this form and return it within 20 days from the date of mailing shown below may subject you (or the party on whose behalf you are being served) to liability for the payment of any expenses incurred in serving a summons on you in any other manner permitted by law.

if you are being served on behalf of a corporation, an unincorporated association (including a partnership), or other entity, this form must be signed by you in the name of such entity or by a person authorized to receive service of process on behalf of such entity. In all other cases, this form must be signed by you personally or by a person authorized by you to acknowledge receipt of summons. If you return this form to the sender, service of a summons is deemed complete on the day you sign the acknowledgment of receipt below.

Date of mailing: February 6, 2008

LEANDRO H. DURAN

(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)

ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF RECEIPT

This acknowledges receipt of (to be completed by sender before mailing);

A copy of the summons and of the complaint.

2. V Other (specify):

Civil Case Cover Sheet, Notice of Case Management Conference, blank Case Management Statement, ADR packet, Stipulation and Order to appropriate dispute resolution, Div. II Rules, CourtCall Instructions, blank Request for CourtCall Telephonic Appearance.

(To be completed by recipient):

Date this form is signed:

(TYPE OR PRINT YOUR NAME AND NAME OF ENTITY, IF ANY, ON WHOSE BEHALF THIS FORM IS SIGNED)

Page 1 of 1

Form Adopted for Mandatory Use Judicial Cottnol of California POS-015 [Rev. January 1, 2005]

NOTICE AND ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF RECEIPT - CIVIL

Code of Civil Procedure, 55 416.30, 417.10 learn countriologo.gov

T SE A PARTY IN THIS CASE)

Feb. 13. 2008 2:20°M ALLSTATE

No. 8685 P. 9

NOTICE OF CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE

VALLE

ENDORSED FILED

JAN-1 7 2008

ALLSTATE

Clerk of the Superior Court By R. Manigamery Case No. CIV 469346

ate: MAY 2 8 2008

Time: 9:00 a.m.

Dept. 1 on Tuesday & Thursday
Dept. 28 on Wednesday & Friday

You are hereby given notice of your Case Management Conference. The date, time and department have been written above.

- In accordance with applicable California Rules of Court and Local Rules 2.3(d)1-4 and 2.3(m), you are hereby ordered to:
 - a. Serve all named defendants and file proofs of service on those defendants with the court within 60 days of filing the complaint (CRC 201.7).
 - Serve a copy of this notice, Case Management Statement and ADR Information Sheet on all named parties in this action.
 - c. File and serve a completed Case Management Statement at least 15 days before the Case Management Conference [CRC 212(g)]. Failure to do so may result in monetary sanctions.
 - d. Meet and confer, in person or by telephone, to consider each of the issues identified in CRC 212(f) no later than 30 days before the date set for the Case Management Conference.
- 2. If you fail to follow the orders above, you are ordered to show cause why you should not be sanctioned. The Order To Show Cause hearing will be at the same time as the Case Management Conference hearing. Sanctions may include monetary, evidentiary or issue sanctions as well as striking pleadings and/or dismissal.
- 3. Continuances of case management conferences are highly disfavored unless good cause is shown.
- 4. Parties may proceed to an appropriate dispute resolution process ("ADR") by filing a Stipulation To ADR and Proposed Order (see attached form.). If plaintiff files a Stipulation To ADR and Proposed Order electing to proceed to judicial arbitration, the Case Management Conference will be taken off the court calendar and the case will be referred to the Arbitration Administrator. If plaintiffs and defendants file a completed stipulation to another ADR process (e.g., mediation) 10 days prior to the first scheduled case management conference, the case management conference will be continued for 90 days to allow parties time to complete their ADR session. The court will notify parties of their new case management conference date.
- 5. If you have filed a default or a judgment has been entered, your case is not automatically taken off the Case Management Conference Calendar. If "Does", "Roes", etc. are named in your complaint, they must be dismissed in order to close the case. If any party is in bankruptcy, the case is stayed only as to that named party.
- 6. You are further ordered to appear in person* (or through your attorney of record) at the Case Management Conference noticed above. You must be thoroughly familiar with the case and fully authorized to proceed.
- 7. The Case Management judge will issue orders at the conclusion of the conference that may include:
 - a. Referring parties to voluntary ADR and setting an ADR completion date;
 - b. Dismissing or severing claims or parties;
 - c. Setting a trial date.
- 8. The Case Management judge may be the trial judge in this case.

For further information regarding case management policies and procedures, see the court website at www.sarumateocourt.org.

* Telephonic appearances at case management conferences are available by contacting CourtCall T.T.C. an independent PAGE 9/12 * RCVD AT 2/13/2008 4:20:10 PM [Central Standard Time] * SVR:CHI2KRF01/21 * DNIS:4781 * CSID:9254547473 * DURATION (mm-ss):03-44

1 CYNTHIA L. MELLEMA (State Bar No. 122798) MEGAN L. DUNHAM (State Bar No. 245991) 2 SONNENSCHEIN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP 2121 N California Blvd., Suite 800 3 Walnut Creek, CA 94596 Telephone: (925) 949-2600 4 Facsimile: (925) 949-2610 Email: cmellema@sonnenschein.com mdunham@sonnenschein.com 5 6 Attorneys for Defendant ALLSTATE INSURANCE COMPANY 7 8 SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA 9 COUNTY OF SAN MATEO 10 11 KATTY VALLE, IVANIA RAMIREZ. No. CIV469346 JANET RAMIREZ and ZENEYDA 12 BALTODANO. MONNENSCHEIN NATH & ROBENTHAL LLP 2121 NORTH CALEORNIA BLYD, SETHE 800 WALNIT CREEK, CALEORNIA 94596-7342 (925) 949-2600 13 Plaintiffs. 14 VS. 15 ALLSTATE INSURANCE COMPANY. 16 Defendants. 17 18 19 20 as follows: 21 GENERAL DENIAL 22 Pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 431.30(d), Allstate generally denies the 23 24 25 26 111 27 111

endorsed filed SAN MATEO COUNTY

MAR 1 9 2008

Clerk of the Superior Court By ___ A. De Leon

DEPUTY GLERK

DEFENDANT ALLSTATE INSURANCE COMPANY'S ANSWER TO PLAINTIFFS' COMPLAINT

BY FAX

Defendant Allstate Insurance Company ("Allstate") hereby answers the unverified Complaint of Katty Valle, Ivania Ramirez, Janet Ramirez and Zeneyda Baltodano ("Plaintiffs")

material allegations of Plaintiffs' Complaint, and each cause of action against Allstate contained therein. Further, Allstate denies that Plaintiffs have suffered any damages as alleged in the Complaint, or in any amount or at all, due to any act, error or omission of Allstate.

28 111

No. CIV469346

ALLSTATE INS. CO.'S ANSWER TO PLAINTIFFS' COMPLAINT

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES

(Applicable To All Causes of Action)

First Defense

(Failure to State a Cause of Action)

The Complaint, and each and every purported cause of action therein, fails to state facts sufficient to constitute a cause of action against Allstate.

Second Defense

(Waiver)

The Complaint, and each and every purported cause of action therein, is barred against Allstate by the doctrine of waiver.

Third Defense

(Estoppel)

The Complaint, and each and every purported cause of action therein, is barred against Allstate by the doctrine of estoppel.

Fourth Defense

(Laches)

The Complaint, and each and every purported cause of action therein, is barred against Allstate by the doctrine of laches.

Fifth Defense

(Unclean Hands)

The Complaint, and each and every purported cause of action therein, is barred against Allstate by the doctrine of unclean hands.

Sixth Defense

(Fault of Others)

Plaintiffs' damages, the fact and extent of which Allstate denies, were either wholly or partially caused by and/or contributed to by the fault of others, whether that fault be the proximate result of intentional conduct, negligence, breach of contract, or any other type of fault, of persons, firms, corporations or entities other than Allstate, for which Allstate is not

(925) 949-2600

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

responsible.	Such intentional conduct, negligence or fault bars recovery against Allstate or
comparative	ly reduces the percentage of fault or negligence, if any, of Allstate.

Seventh Defense

(Active Fault of Plaintiffs)

The Complaint, and each and every purported cause of action in the Complaint, is barred by the active fault of Plaintiffs and/or Plaintiffs' counsel.

Eighth Defense

(Comparative Fault)

The Complaint, and each and every purported cause of action in the Complaint, is barred and/or Plaintiffs' recovery is reduced because Plaintiffs' alleged damages were the result of Plaintiffs' comparative fault.

Ninth Defense

(No Causation)

Plaintiffs are not entitled to relief from Allstate because they have not sustained any injury, damage or loss by reason of any conduct, act, error or omission on Allstate's part.

Tenth Defense

(Intervening Cause)

Plaintiffs' damages, the fact and extent of which Allstate denies, were proximately caused by intervening, superseding and/or supervening acts for which Allstate has no liability.

Eleventh Defense

(Mitigation of Damages)

Plaintiffs' recovery against Allstate, if any, is barred and/or limited to the extent plaintiffs have failed to mitigate, minimize or avoid any damages they have allegedly suffered.

Twelfth Defense

(Set-Off)

To the extent Allstate is liable to plaintiffs, if at all, Allstate is entitled to a set-off on account of damages sustained by Allstate as a result of Plaintiffs' acts, conduct or omissions.

I & ROSENTHAL LLP	NIA BLVD., SUITE 800	IFORNIA 94596-7342	0.0600
SONNENSCHEIN NATH	2121 NORTH CALIFORD	WALNUT CREEK, CALIFORNIA 94596-7342	1075/07

800	342	
SUITE,	4596-7	
A BLVD.	WALNUT CREEK, CALIFORNIA 94596-7342	2600
IFORNI/	CALIFC	(925) 949-2600
TH CAL	CREEK,	(92
1 NOR	ALNUT	
212	€	

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Thirteenth	Defense
------------	----------------

(Speculative Nature of Damages)

Plaintiffs are not entitled to judgment because their damages claims are speculative.

Fourteenth Defense

(Election of Remedies)

To the extent Plaintiffs have elected to pursue a certain remedy, they are barred from pursuing or recovering under any other remedy under the doctrine of election of remedies.

Fifteenth Defense

(Privilege)

Allstate's alleged acts, conduct and/or omissions were lawful, privileged and/or justified.

Sixteenth Defense

(Accord and Satisfaction)

The Complaint, and each and every purported cause of action therein, is barred by the doctrine of accord and satisfaction.

Seventeenth Defense

(Ratification of Conduct)

With full knowledge of all facts in any way connected with or relating to the matters alleged in the Complaint, Plaintiffs duly ratified, acquiesced and/or confirmed in all respects the conduct and/or omissions of Allstate alleged in the Complaint.

Eighteenth Defense

(Assumption of Risk)

Plaintiffs knew, or in the exercise of reasonable care should have known, the risks of the matters alleged in the Complaint. Plaintiffs knowingly and voluntarily assumed and accepted such risks, and any damages allegedly suffered by Plaintiffs were the proximate result of Plaintiffs' assumptions and acceptance of such risks.

26 111

27 111

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Nineteenth Defe	ense
-----------------	------

(No Coverage for Claimed Losses)

The Complaint, and each and every purported cause of action therein, is barred to the extent that it seeks payment, reimbursement, contribution, or indemnification for, or is based on, a loss that is not covered by, or is excluded from, coverage under the terms, exclusions, conditions and limitations of the Policy.

Twentieth Defense

(Allstate's Compliance With Obligations)

Allstate fully performed all obligations, both express and implied, if any, owed to Plaintiffs under the Policy and applicable law.

Twenty-First Defense

(Policy Limits)

Plaintiffs' Policy is subject to certain deductibles and coverage limits. Even if the policy provided coverage for the alleged loss, that coverage would be subject to the Policy's deductibles and coverage limits.

Twenty-Second Defense

(Failure to Comply With Policy Terms)

The Complaint is barred to the extent the Plaintiffs have failed to perform all of their obligations under the Policy, including their duties to cooperate with Allstate in the processing of claims and to document and substantiate their claimed losses.

Twenty-Third Defense

(Statute of Limitations)

The Complaint is barred by the applicable statutes of limitations, including, but not limited to, California Code of Civil Procedure section 337(1), 337(2), 338(a), (b), (d) and/or (j), 339, 340, 340.6, 340.8 and 343, and Insurance Code sections 2070 and/or 2071.

111 26

27

SONNENSCHEIN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP 2121 NORTH CALIFORNIA BLVD., SUITE 800	WALNUT CREEK, CALIFORNIA 94596-7342
---	-------------------------------------

000				
100000000000000000000000000000000000000	7-646	1		
2001				

	П
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	

2

3

12 13

1415

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

2526

27

28

Twenty-Fourth Defense

(Non-Cooperation)

The Complaint, and each and every purported cause of action therein, is barred by plaintiffs, and/or plaintiffs counsel's failure to cooperate with Allstate.

Twenty-Fifth Defense

(Arbitration Clause)

The Policy states "If you and we disagree on your right to receive any damages or on the amount of damages, then upon written request of either party, the disagreement will be settled by a single neutral arbitrator." Plaintiffs have asserted their right to use an arbitrator.

Accordingly, Plaintiffs' claim for policy benefits is subject to arbitration under the Policy and/or California Insurance Code Section 11580.2.

Twenty-Sixth Defense

(Failure to Comply With Discovery During Arbitration)

The Complaint is barred to the extent Plaintiffs have impeded the arbitration process by refusing to participate in the discovery process (answer interrogatories, provide documents, attend depositions) as required by California Insurance Code Section 11580.2 and under Title 4 of Part 4 of the California Code of Civil Procedure.

Twenty-Seventh Defense

(Good Faith of Allstate)

Allstate's conduct was at all times reasonable and in good faith, not tortious.

Twenty-Eighth Defense

(Reasonableness of Allstate)

Allstate's conduct was at all times reasonable and not tortious.

Twenty-Ninth Defense

(Plaintiffs' Claim Raised Genuine Issues)

Plaintiffs should take nothing pursuant to the Complaint because their claims to Allstate raised genuine issues and/or disputes as to Allstate's duties, if any, under the Allstate

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Automobile Policy at issue in the Complaint (the "Policy"), an	d Allstate's belief in the validity
of these issues and/or disputes was reasonable.	

Thirtieth Defense

(No Punitive or Non-Compensatory Damages)

The Complaint fails to state facts sufficient to entitle Plaintiffs to punitive damages.

Thirty-First Defense

(Unconstitutionality of Punitive Damages)

Plaintiffs' claim for punitive damages is barred because the California punitive damages statute is unconstitutional in that, among other things, it is void for vagueness, violates the equal protection clause, violates the due process clause, is an undue burden on interstate commerce, violates the contract clause, and violates the Eighth Amendment proscription against excessive fines pursuant to the United States and California Constitutions.

Thirty-Second Defense

(No Entitlement to Attorneys' Fees)

Plaintiffs are precluded from recovering attorneys' fees and costs from Allstate under applicable provisions of the law.

Thirty-Third Defense

(Stay of Plaintiffs Cause of Action for Bad Faith)

Plaintiffs cause of action for breach of the covenant of good faith and fair dealing should be stayed pending completion of the arbitration.

Thirty-Fourth Defense

(Right To Assert Additional Defenses)

WHEREFORE, Allstate prays for judgment as follows:

- That Plaintiffs take nothing by way of their Complaint; 1.
- That the Complaint be dismissed with prejudice and judgment entered in favor of 2. Allstate;
- That Allstate be awarded costs and attorneys' fees incurred in this action; and 3.
- For such other and further relief as this Court deems just and proper. 4.

1	Dated: March 19, 2008	
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21	-	
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		

Respectfully submitted,

SONNENSCHEIN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP

Attorneys for Defendant ALLSTATE INSURANCE COMPANY

7

8

9

1

2

10 11

12

13 14

15

SONNENSCHEIN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP 2121 NORTH CALIFORNIA BLVD., SUITE 800 WALNUT CREEK, CA 94596-7342 (925) 949-2600

16

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

25

2627

28

PROOF OF SERVICE

I, Gloria Courtney, hereby declare:

I am employed in the City of Walnut Creek, and in the County of Contra Costa, California, in the office of a member of the bar of this court, at whose direction the following service was made. I am over the age of eighteen years and not a party to the within action. My business address is Sonnenschein, Nath & Rosenthal, LLP, 2121 North California Blvd., Suite 800, Walnut Creek, California 94596-7342.

On March 19, 2008, I caused to be served on the interested parties in this action the following document(s): **DEFENDANT ALLSTATE INSURANCE COMPANY'S ANSWER TO PLAINTIFFS' COMPLAINT**, by placing a true copy(ies) thereof, on the above date, enclosed in a sealed envelope, following the ordinary business practice of Sonnenschein Nath & Rosenthal LLP, as follows:

Attorney for Plaintiffs:

Leandro H. Duran Law Office of Leandro H. Duran 1035 Carleton Street Berkeley, California 94710

Telephone: (510) 540-1046 Facsimile: (510) 540-1036

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct, and that this declaration was executed on March 19, 2008, at Walnut Creek, California.

Gloria Courtney